DISPATCH	CLASSIFICATION CONFIDENTIAL	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO. EGMA-57706

TO — Chief, IO (Attn: ⊏

INFO — EE, COS/G

HEADQUARTERS FILE NO.
200-134-10/5
200-124-39/3
FF: RLS/559,564

FROM Chief, Munich Operations Group	DATE 9 February 1962

SUBJECT
CAMOG/DTDORIC/TPFEELING/QKACTIVE/Operations
Transmittal of Memo

RE: "43-3" — (CHECK "X" ONE)

	MARKED FOR INDEXING
XX	NO INDEXING REQUIRED

ACTION REQUIRED
As appropriate

INDEXING CAN BE JUDGED
BY QUALIFIED HQ. DESK ONLY

REFERENCE(S)

Forwarded under separate cover true name pouch is a self-explanatory memo from ⊏ ⊐ which has also been approved by ⊏
If Headquarters is in agreement with this recommendation ⸴it is requested that they take this matter up with the appropriate Headquarters office.

Attachment: Under Separate Cover _attached_ RiD/An 20 FEB 1962
    Memo

Distribution:
    2 -IO w/att usc
    1 -EE wo/att
    2 -COS/G wo/att

CS COPY

200-124-39/3

FORM 10-57 **53** (40)	USE PREVIOUS EDITION. REPLACES FORMS 51-28, 51-28A AND 51-29 WHICH ARE OBSOLETE.	CLASSIFICATION CONFIDENTIAL		PAGE NO. 1

CONTINUED

31 January 1962

M E M O R A N D U M

SUBJECT: Clearance Procedures -- AMCOMLIB and RFE

          Headquarters has, in the past, been receptive to sug-
gestions looking toward the simplification of clearance procedures.
Prior requests for additional authority to grant provisional ap-
provals in the field have in each instance received a favorable
response. I would like, at this time, to make an additional pro-
posal which may assist us in arriving at security determinations
which are based upon all available information and which will, for
that reason, reflect a more basic unanimity of approach.

          It is suggested that prior to making a final determination
on possible security disapprovals of incumbent non-American employees
at AMCOMLIB or RFE in Munich, comments should be solicited from the
Security Officer. These comments have generally been forthcoming
anyway. It is the feeling here that they might better be used by
Headquarters prior to a final determination being made. Otherwise,
they serve only as part of a usually vain effort to effect a reversal
of Headquarters' decision.

          The proposal is in no way motivated by a desire to usurp
Headquarters' authority or prerogatives. Rather, it is motivated
by a desire to ensure that in all cases involving a possible disap-
proval (with consequent request for termination) Headquarters has
the benefit of such comments as might be forthcoming from the field.
In many cases these comments will reflect close personal association
with the Subject over several years. In all cases they will reflect
some aspect of his activities and conduct within the Project which
might be pertinent to the final determination to be made.

          There is no need here to detail the cases in which there
has existed some difference of opinion regarding disapprovals. The
number is quite limited, but the reasoning behind our dissent should
perhaps be clarified. In cases involving non-Americans, both the
Security Officer and Headquarters are assessing virtually the same
information. In most cases, there appears to be more information
available to us than to Headquarters. This results from the avail-
ability to us of such things as agent contact reports, etc., recorded
locally but not submitted to Headquarters. In addition, in almost
each instance we have ready access to friends, contacts, former
employers and references of the Subject. Since Headquarters and
the field have, in effect, reviewed substantially the same informa-
tion, and since our decision has been to approve, and yours to dis-
approve, some dissent is inevitable. That the decision made in the

field could have been the wrong one is readily admitted. It is
suggested only that Headquarters should have the benefit of our
reasoning before arriving at a final determination. It is hoped
that Headquarters will give favorable consideration to this sug-
gestion.